

# New York Times.

LATE CITY EDITION

U. S. Weather Bureau Report (Page 70) forecasts  
Clearing, then fair today; fair,  
cooler tonight and tomorrow.  
Temp. Range: 85-70; yesterday: 93-68.  
Temp. - Hum. Index: 74; yesterday: 60.

SDAY, JUNE 24, 1965.

TEN CENTS

## MOSCOW REBUFFS WILSON MISSION ON VIETNAM TALK

Premier Says Soviet Is Not  
Authorized to Negotiate—  
London Sees Some Hope

By PETER GROSE

Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, Thursday, June 24

The Soviet Union today rejected a proposal of British Commonwealth Prime Ministers for negotiations aimed at a settlement in Vietnam.

In a statement, the Government suggested that the Commonwealth delegation, to be headed by Prime Minister Wilson, consult directly with the Government of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front, the political body of the insurgents in the South.

The statement made public by Tass, the Soviet press agency quoted Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin as having said:

"The Soviet Government has not been authorized by anyone to conduct talks on a settlement in Vietnam. The Soviet Government does not intend to conduct such negotiations."

### Other Approaches Urged

"In the opinion of the Soviet Government," the Kosygin statement continued, "on this question one should approach the government of that country which fell victim to aggression—the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—and also the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam, which represents the South Vietnamese people."

(A spokesman for the Commonwealth Conference in London said the mission intended to go ahead with its plans despite Moscow's reply. The spokesman said the Soviet note "leaves the door partly open." Page 3.)

## Kennedy Proposes Treaty To Check Nuclear Spread

White House Is Cool to Plan to Assign  
'Central Priority' to Pact That Would  
Include Chinese Communist Regime

By E. W. KENWORTHY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 23—Senator Robert F. Kennedy urged President Johnson today to assign "central priority" to a treaty that would halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

Sixteen other Senators commended Mr. Kennedy for his re-

Text of Kennedy's speech  
is printed on Page 16.

marks, but the comment from the White House was short and chilly.

In his speech, which he regarded as his first major floor address, Mr. Kennedy said the Administration should "at once" initiate negotiations with nations having a nuclear capability, including Communist China, and with those having a nuclear potential.

In addition to Communist China, the nations that now have the capacity to explode nuclear bombs are the United

States, the Soviet Union, Britain and France. Mr. Kennedy estimated that 18 nations would be in a position to develop nuclear weapons within three years.

The 1963 treaty to prevent all but underground nuclear tests, Senator Kennedy said, was the first step, taken at the initiative of the United States.

"But we have not yet taken the second step," he went on. "The world has not moved beyond the limited nuclear test ban itself, to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons."

The New York Democrat continued:

"We cannot allow the demands of day-to-day policy to obstruct our efforts to solve the problem of nuclear spread. We cannot wait for peace in Southeast Asia—which will not come until nuclear weapons have spread beyond recall. We can-

Continued on Page 16, Column 5

## Rusk Asks Hanoi to Resist Peking and Seek U.S. Talk

By MAX FRANKEL

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 23—Secretary of State Dean Rusk invited North Vietnam today to help resist Communist China's "ambitions" by charting its own course toward negotiations with the United States.

Mr. Rusk said he found it hard to understand why the North Vietnamese Government in Hanoi had aligned itself so firmly with Peking and why it chose to bear the costs of con-

BONN SCORES REDS  
ON BERLIN MOVES

## O.A.S. TO PROCLAIM TRUSTEESHIP PLAN IN SANTO DOMINGO

Inter-American Committee's  
Program Is Expected to Be  
Announced Next Week

### CABINET TO BE SET UP

Some Officers to Lose Jobs  
—Rebels and Junta Reply  
to Earlier Peace Formula

By RICHARD EDER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 23—A plan to turn the Dominican Republic into what would in effect be a temporary trusteeship of the Organization of American States has been drawn up by the three-man O.A.S. committee in Santo Domingo.

The plan is to be proclaimed shortly, probably next week. The proclamation will await the receipt of a reply from the Dominican junta, led by Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras, to a less specific proposal made by the inter-American organization last Friday.

A reply to the original formula was made today by the rebels, led by Col. Francisco Caamaño Dénó. They accepted several of the points in the original O.A.S. proposal but rejected others, chiefly those dealing with the future of rebel military officers.

[In Santo Domingo, General Imbert gave his counterproposal to the O.A.S. His position was that his junta should be the key to any provisional government. Page 12.]

### Plan May Be Imposed

According to United States officials who have been closely involved with the shaping of







...and further progress would certainly impel the Egyptians to intensify their present efforts. Similar developments are possible all over the world.

### 'Kays Millions Would Die

Once nuclear war were to start, even between small remote countries, it would be exceedingly difficult to stop a step-by-step progression of local war into a general conflagration.

Eighty million Americans—and hundreds of millions of other people—would die within the first 24 hours of a full-scale nuclear exchange. And as Chairman Khrushchev once said, the survivors would envy the dead.

This is not an acceptable future. We owe it to ourselves, to our children, to our forebears and our prosperity, to prevent such a holocaust. But the proliferation of nuclear weapons immensely increases the chances that the world might stumble into catastrophe.

President Kennedy saw this clearly. He said, in 1963, "I ask you to stop and think what it would mean to have nuclear weapons in so many hands, in the hands of countries large and small, stable and unstable, responsible and irresponsible scattered throughout the world. There would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament."

There would be no stability anywhere in the world—when nuclear weapons might be used between Greeks and Turks over Cyprus; between Arabs and Israelis over the Gaza Strip; between India and Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch. But if nuclear weapons spread, it is dangerously likely that they will be so used—for these are matters of the deepest national interest to the countries involved.

### 'Could Be No Security'

There could be no security—when a decision to use these weapons might be made by an unstable demagogue, or by the head of one of the innumerable two-month governments that plague so many countries, or by an irresponsible military commander, or even by an individual pilot. But if nuclear weapons spread, they may be thus set off—for it is far more difficult and expensive to construct an adequate system of control and custody than to develop the weapons themselves.

There could be no effective disarmament—when each nation would want guarantees, not from one or two or five powers, but from a dozen or a score or even more nations. But if nuclear weapons spread, such guarantees would be necessary.

Think just of the unparalleled opportunities for mischief: A bomb obliterates the capital city of a nation in Latin America, or Africa, or Asia—or even the Soviet Union, or the United States. How was it delivered—by plane? By missile? By car or ship? There is no evidence. From

point Kennedy had told the President to his face that he was not telling the truth.

### Other Incidents

Other recent incidents involving the Kennedy brothers and the President include the following:

9 In speeches in May, Robert Kennedy took a muted but clear stand against the Johnson Administration's intervention in the Dominican Republic "without regard to our friends and allies in the Organization of American States."

9 He also issued a somewhat less clear warning against efforts to achieve a strictly military solution to the crisis in Vietnam.

9 When the President's voting rights bill came before the Senate, Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts led a liberal force that came within three votes of upsetting Mr. Johnson and the Senate leadership of both parties by writing a ban on the poll tax into the bill.

### Differ on Districting

Another contest may come soon on the issue of reapportionment. Robert Kennedy has taken a strong position in favor of the one-man, one-vote rule of the Supreme Court and against a constitutional amendment that would nullify it. The amendment is being sponsored by the Senate Republican leader, Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, a consistent if unspoken ally of Mr. Johnson.

The President is not expected to oppose Mr. Dirksen openly, and Mr. Kennedy may be able to seize the leadership of liberals opposed to the amendment.

But friends of the Kennedy brothers and informed political sources deride the idea that the Kennedys are moving to challenge the President's leadership, or that they are already maneuvering directly for a Presidential or Vice-Presidential nomination in the future.

The best evidence indicates, instead, that Robert and Edward Kennedy are taking advantage of their strong popular identification and of their positions as Senators from major urban states to improve their political positions. And it is not unusual for Senators to differ with a President, even of the same party.

Today's speech by Robert Kennedy, for instance, probably would have caused little stir if it had been delivered by any number of other Democratic Senators—even considering its remarks on Communist China.

The difference was not so much in the speech but in the identity of the man who gave it. And as Robert and Edward Kennedy continue to establish themselves as political leaders in their own right, there is likely to be more of the same

where did it come—a jealous neighbor? An internal dissident? A great power bent on stirring up trouble—or an anonymous madman? There is only speculation. And what can be the response—what

### Political Risks

It was also argued that Senators named Kennedy face a particular danger in any vendetta with Mr. Johnson. The President is highly popular in the Democratic party and the country and even routine opposition to him could be politically risky; coming from the Kennedy brothers it could seem petty and personally motivated.

Two instances point, anyway, to the fact that the Kennedys are operating as politicians, not as dedicated anti-Johnson men.

One was when Edward Kennedy took part with Senator Philip A. Hart, Democrat of Michigan, and Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York, in an unsuccessful last-minute effort to strike a compromise on the poll tax ban that would have avoided the vote that nearly upset the President.

It was the Senate majority leader, Mike Mansfield of Montana, who rejected this effort and set the stage for the close vote.

At about the same time, Robert Kennedy rejected a move that could have sparked a serious Senate uprising against Mr. Johnson on the Vietnam issue. Here is what happened, according to one well-informed Senator:

There was widespread uneasiness in the Senate, particularly among Democratic liberals, at the President's request last spring for a \$700 million appropriation for the Vietnamese effort.

### Seen as 'Bank Check'

Robert Kennedy was among those who considered this a request for a "blank check" and briefly considered opposing it. A leading Democratic liberal who felt the same way informed Mr. Kennedy that if he would speak out and take the lead, a number of other Senators would go along.

His meaning was plain. If the brother and heir apparent of President Kennedy threw his name, prestige and political power against Mr. Johnson's Vietnamese policy, others would be emboldened to stand up in the protecting shadow of a Kennedy.

But Mr. Kennedy chose to stand by the President. The appropriation passed by 88 to 3, with both Kennedys voting for it. It would have passed in any case but the opposition of a Kennedy could have produced an impressive total against Mr. Johnson on what amounted to an issue of confidence.

Thus the prevailing opinion among informed persons here is that the Kennedys are staking out the position of liberal leadership that is virtually required of Democratic Senators from New York and Massachusetts. But no one, least of all the White House, is losing sight of the fact that such a position is required of anyone who hopes to get anywhere at a Democratic National Convention.

but a reprisal grounded on suspicion, leading in ever-widening circles to the utter destruction of the world we know.

It is clear, in short, that the United States—and the

And at the outset of this journey, we cannot allow the demands of day-to-day policy to obstruct our efforts to solve the problem of nuclear spread. We cannot wait for peace in Southeast Asia—which will not come until nuclear weapons have spread beyond recall. We cannot wait for a general European settlement—which has not existed since 1914. We cannot wait until all nations learn to behave for bad behavior armed with nuclear weapons is the danger we must try to prevent.

Rather we must begin to move now, as on many fronts as possible, to meet the problem. With every day that passes, the likelihood increases that another nation will develop the bomb; and every new possessor will lead others to abandon the restraint that alone keeps them from acquiring a nuclear capability now. William Foster, head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has pointed out that as long as the problem involved only the United States and the Soviet Union, a delay of a year or more was not fatal to the conclusion of an agreement. But in the multination problem in which we now find ourselves, "a delay of a year or so, or perhaps even of months... could well mean the difference between failure and success."

I therefore urge immediate action along the following lines:

First, we should initiate at once negotiations with the Soviet Union and other nations with nuclear capability or potential, looking toward a nonproliferation treaty. This treaty would bind the major nuclear powers not to transfer nuclear weapons or weapons capability to nations not now in possession of them. And it would pledge nations without nuclear arms, on their part, not to acquire or develop these weapons.

### Guarantee Is Urged

This pledge would require a third component: the extension to all nations foregoing nuclear weapons a guarantee against nuclear aggression or blackmail. We presently protect our allies against nuclear attack. But our alliance umbrella does not extend to non-aligned nations such as India; and while the President indicated that the United States would help them resist nuclear blackmail, more specific and definite measures are needed. If these nations are to forgo nuclear weapons—especially when their neighbors may possess them—they must be guaranteed against nuclear aggression.

To be effective, such a guarantee would have to be extended by the United States and the Soviet Union bilaterally—or better still, by a group of nuclear powers. But I would warn that such an umbrella—if it is to be effective, and if it is not to lead to great-power confrontations all over the world—must be divorced from and superior to the other policy

ers not to transfer weapons and weapons to nations not now them and pledging

aim of the nations. We cannot protect friends from nuclear or allow nations to be otherwise threatened by weapons. We must stand against nuclear aggression.

A treaty to prevent spread, as Mr. Kennedy indicated, is manifestly a paramount interest of the United States and the Union. It is by far an important step we take to stop the nuclear weapons.

There have been suggestions that the chief block to such a treaty in Vietnam. Far apart from the straining from that war, have not ourselves we can to secure liberation treaty.

The most prominent is the question of multilateral force, variant Atlantic force. The Soviet Union tends that either give control over weapons to West, although we disagree that view, the Soviet has absolutely refused a nonproliferation agreement as long forward with the A.N.F. We have done the M.D. plans, because West feels that it must greater role in the

### 'In Interest of Eve

But if a nonproliferation treaty can be will be in the national interest of every nation. Therefore continue increased concern, for a form of nuclear antecede to West Germany and other countries which meets their out meeting with by the Soviet Union might evolve from consultation device at the NATO Defense Secretary.

Second, we should explore the creation of a nuclear-free world. Right now, the greatest assets is is not one nuclear all of Latin America. This situation served if the nuclear pledge not to introduce nuclear weapons areas, the nations of pledge not to acquire and appropriate for the verification pledges is set up. Nations—particularly America—have changed informal to this effect. We encourage them to in every possible should extend similar in Africa. And if they are successful, we on Israel and the states of the Middle East make the same I am not, however



at the outset of this movement. We cannot allow the hands of day-to-day policy to obstruct our efforts to solve the problem of nuclear arms. We cannot wait for the South East Asia which will not come until nuclear weapons have spread and recall. We cannot wait for a general European agreement which has not been since 1914. We cannot wait until all nations begin to behave for bad behavior armed with nuclear weapons is the danger we must try to prevent.

Whether we must begin to do now, as on many fronts possible, to meet the problem. With every day that passes, the likelihood increases that another nation will develop the bomb; and every new possessor will lead us to abandon the restraint that alone keeps them from acquiring a nuclear capability now. William Foster, head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, pointed out that as long as the problem involved only the United States and the Soviet Union, a delay of a year or more was not fatal to the conclusion of an agreement. But in the multination problem in which we now find ourselves, "a delay of a year or so, or perhaps even months, could well mean a difference between failure and success."

We therefore urge immediate action along the following lines: First, we should initiate at once negotiations with the Soviet Union and other nations with nuclear capability potential, looking toward nonproliferation treaty. A treaty would bind the nuclear powers not to transfer nuclear weapons or weapons capability to nations not now in possession of them. It would pledge nations without nuclear arms, on their part, not to acquire or develop these weapons.

#### Guarantee Is Urged

This pledge would require third component: the extension to all nations foregoing nuclear weapons a guarantee against nuclear aggression or blackmail. We presently protect our allies against nuclear attack. But our alliance umbrella does not extend to non-aligned nations such as India; and while the President indicated that the United States could help them resist nuclear blackmail, more specific and definite measures are needed. If these nations are to forgo nuclear weapons—especially when their neighbors may possess them—they must be guaranteed against nuclear aggression.

To be effective, such a guarantee would have to be extended by the United States and the Soviet Union bilaterally—or better still, by a group of nuclear powers. I would warn that such an umbrella—if it is to be effective, and if it is not to lead to great-power confrontations all over the world—must be divorced from and superior to the other policy

aims of the nations involved. We cannot protect only our friends from nuclear attack or allow nations with whom we are otherwise friendly to threaten others with nuclear weapons. We must stand against nuclear aggression period.

A treaty to prevent nuclear spread, as Mr. Foster has indicated, is manifestly in the paramount interest of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is by far the most important step we now can take to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. There have been suggestions that the chief stumbling block to such a treaty is the war in Vietnam. But wholly apart from the strains resulting from that war, I think we have not ourselves done all we can to secure a nonproliferation treaty.

The most prominent example is the question of the multilateral force, and the variant Atlantic nuclear force. The Soviet Union contends that either plan would give control over nuclear weapons to West Germany; although we disagree with that view, the Soviet Union has absolutely refused to conclude a nonproliferation agreement as long as we go forward with the M.L.F. or the A.N.F. We have not abandoned the M.L.F.-A.N.F. plans, because West Germany feels that it must have a greater role in nuclear deterrence.

#### 'In Interest of Every Nation'

But if a nonproliferation treaty can be concluded, it will be in the national interest of every nation. We should therefore continue, with increased concern, our search for a form of nuclear guarantee to West Germany and other countries of Europe which meets their needs without meeting with rejection by the Soviet Union—such as might evolve from the allied consultation device suggested at the NATO meeting by Defense Secretary McNamara.

Second, we should immediately explore the creation of formal nuclear-free zones of the world. Right now, one of our greatest assets is that there is not one nuclear weapon in all of Latin America or Africa. This situation can be preserved if the nuclear powers pledge not to introduce any nuclear weapons into these areas, the nations of the areas pledge not to acquire them, and appropriate machinery for the verification of these pledges is set up. Some nations—particularly in Latin America—have already exchanged informal assurances to this effect. We should encourage them to go further in every possible way. We should extend similar efforts in Africa. And if these efforts are successful, we should call on Israel and the neighboring states of the Middle East to make the same commitment. I am not, however, suggest-

ing that present circumstances permit the creation of nuclear-free zones in the Far East or in Europe.

Third, we should complete the partial test-ban agreement of 1963 by extending it to underground as well as above-ground tests. Since 1963, we have made considerable scientific progress in detecting underground tests in distinguishing many natural tremors from man-made explosions. Without jeopardizing our security, we can now extend the test-ban to certain types of underground tests. And as soon as scientific advances makes it possible to extend the test ban to any other type or size of underground test without jeopardizing security, it should be done. And we should also press all efforts to resolve the deadlock on inspections of those explosions which cannot be firmly identified without inspection. So let us return to the conference table, for the completion of this treaty would be a natural complement to nonproliferation agreement. It would provide an additional incentive to nonnuclear powers to forgo a weapons-development program. And it would help to restore the momentum of the test-ban treaty itself.

Fourth, we should act to halt and reverse the growth of the nuclear capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union—both as to fissionable material for military weapons purposes and as to the strategic devices to deliver such material. Freezing these weapons at their present levels—which, as we all know, are more than adequate to destroy all human life on this earth—is a prerequisite to lowering those levels in the future.

#### A Cutback Is Urged

Moreover, it would be in the direct self-interest of the United States and the Soviet Union to cut back our nuclear forces. For as Secretary McNamara has shown, we each have more than enough to destroy the other nation—yet can never acquire enough to prevent our own destruction. And even substantial cutbacks would not affect our nuclear superiority over China in the foreseeable future. Most of all, it is essential that the two superpowers demonstrate to the world, by concrete example, their determination to turn away from weapons of absolute destruction, toward a world order based on other strengths. Here again, President Johnson has taken the initiative with the slowdown in production of plutonium and uranium 235, and with the phasing-out of certain bombers. Much more remains to be done.

Fifth, we should move to strengthen and support the International Atomic Energy

Agency. Efforts to lessen our reliance on nuclear weapons. Since 1961, we have worked to build up our nonnuclear forces, and those of our allies, so that if conflict comes, we need not choose between defeat and mutual annihilation. We have not yet been fully successful: only the United States and West Germany have met their full conventional force commitment to NATO. But we should continue to pursue this course. For our efforts to induce others to forgo nuclear forces depend in large part on our ability and willingness to sharply limit the possible use of our own.

#### Chinese Problem Cited

As to all these points—in all our efforts—we will have to deal with one of the most perplexing and difficult questions affecting American foreign policy: China. It is difficult to negotiate on any question with the intransigent leaders of Communist China. And it is doubly difficult when we are engaged in South Vietnam. China is profoundly suspicious of and hostile to us—as we are highly suspicious of her.

But China is there. China will have nuclear weapons. And without her participation it will be infinitely more difficult, perhaps impossible in the long run, to prevent nuclear proliferation. This was recognized, just last week, by 70 nations at the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations, who urged that China be included in any nonproliferation agreement.

It has been recognized by President Johnson, who has repeatedly offered to negotiate with any government in the world as to the peace of Southeast Asia. And it has been recognized by the American people, who voted overwhelmingly in a recent poll for negotiations with the Chinese.

At an appropriate time and manner, therefore, we should vigorously pursue negotiations on this subject with China. But if we must ultimately have the cooperation of China, and the Soviet Union, and France, and all other nations with any nuclear capability whatever, it does not follow that we should wait for that cooperation before beginning our efforts.

#### 'We Are Stronger'

We are stronger—and therefore have more responsibility—than any nation on earth; we should make the first effort—the greatest effort—and the last effort—to control nuclear weapons. We can and must begin immediately.

In this connection, I urge that the work of the Glipathic Committee—which included many distinguished public servants such as Arthur Dean—approved by the President to study the problem of nuclear proliferation, be carried forward by all concerned agencies of the Government at once. It is only by study and action by general

meetings and demonstrations for either of Kenya's rival trade union groups.

He also ordered that the relative trade union movement be put under a penetrating review.

The tough wording of the President's proclamation suggested that his patience had been exhausted by the strikes, threatened strikes, public heckling and misuse of workers' funds that have increasingly plagued the trade union movement for months.

"I believe that the decision I have made is in the interests of the workers and the country as a whole," Mr. Kenyatta said. "The people of Kenya are determined to forge ahead and to insure economic and social advancement."

"We cannot do all these things when each day we read of threats of strikes and even threats against the Government itself and when some of the leaders who should be concerned with promoting the workers' interests spend all of their time and the workers' trade union contributions for non-trade-union activities."



Not too heavy, not too light. The bright taste in Scotch. A clean, clear, crisp flavor that shines true. Right through the whole drink. Find out tonight. Try Harvey's (Bright? You may call it brilliant!).

The Only English Market Blend  
S.A. Proctor & Co. Inc., New York, N.Y. 10004



# Urging Pact to Check Nuclear Weapons Spread

## Kennedy, in Senate, Asks Pact To Check Nuclear Proliferation

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

not wait for a general European settlement—which has not existed since 1914. We cannot wait until all nations learn to behave—for bad behavior armed with nuclear weapons is the danger we must try to prevent.”

Asked for comment after the speech, George E. Reedy, the White House press secretary, recalled that on Nov. 1 of last year the President had appointed a special committee headed by Roswell L. Gilpatric, former Under Secretary of Defense, “to look into this matter.”

### Report Forwarded

Mr. Reedy said the Gilpatric report, which is still classified as top secret, had been forwarded to the State and Defense Departments, the Atomic Energy Commission and other interested agencies for study.

“Of course, we are glad Senator Kennedy is also interested in this field,” Mr. Reedy said.

After Mr. Kennedy’s speech, Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat of New Mexico, who is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, told the Senate that the Gilpatric report had not been made available to that committee nor to the Armed Services Committee.

At a news conference later, Mr. Kennedy was asked why the report had not been shown to these committees.

“You better ask the executive department,” he said.

In reply to another question, he intimated that the Gilpatric report, which he said had been filed with the White House three months ago, had created some dissension. Mr. Kennedy was asked whether he believed that President Johnson had not carried forward the nuclear policies of his predecessor, the Senator’s brother.

“No,” Mr. Kennedy replied.

“But I think we need a fresh initiative. There are disputes within the executive departments on how some of these matters should be handled. We should make a decision on how far we want to go and then proceed. We should not let the matter drag on.”

Just before Mr. Kennedy made the speech, Vice President Humphrey, who was about to leave the chamber, told him he had read the speech and believed it “thoughtful and constructive.”

Mr. Kennedy suggested that the Administration should take these actions:

1. Begin negotiations on a treaty binding the nuclear powers not to transfer nuclear weapons and weapons capability to nations not now possessing them and pledging the nonnu-

clear nations not to acquire or develop them.

2. Explore the creation of formal nuclear-free zones, beginning with Latin America and Africa.

3. Extend the test-ban agreement to detectable underground tests.

4. Freeze United States and Soviet stockpiles of fissionable material and halt the growth of delivery systems.

5. Strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency by insisting that all reactors for peaceful purposes built with the help of other powers be subject to inspection by the agency.

On the question of negotiating with Communist China, Mr. Kennedy said he recognized the difficulty because of the intransigence of Peking. The war in Vietnam makes this problem “doubly difficult,” he said.

“But,” he said, “China is there. China will have nuclear weapons. And without her participation it will be infinitely more difficult, perhaps impossible in the long run, to prevent nuclear proliferation.”

When he was asked later whether he was recommending diplomatic recognition of Communist China by the United States, Mr. Kennedy said that he was not, at least at present. He said he also opposed the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

He insisted, however, that negotiations were still possible without recognition, and cited the meetings between the American and Chinese Ambassadors in Warsaw.

Mr. Kennedy also said the United States might consider an alternative to the proposed multinational nuclear force since the Soviet Union had “absolutely refused to conclude a nonproliferation treaty” so long as the United States proceeded with a plan that Moscow regards as giving West Germany “control over nuclear weapons.”

Mr. Kennedy did not represent his proposals as original, because they approximated in many respects the thinking within the Disarmament Agency. Nevertheless, he indicated a belief that the Administration was losing the momentum gained by the test ban treaty. Many Senators apparently agreed.

The first to compliment him was the Majority Leader, Mike Mansfield of Montana, who said:

“It is a speech that should have been given because as long as we accept the status quo, the more we will continue to move backward.”

Senator George D. Aiken, Republican of Vermont, then said he hoped top officials in all countries would read it because it dealt with efforts needed “to make sure that things that could happen do not happen.”

Agency This agency is the only truly international vehicle for inspecting peaceful atomic energy plants to assure that they are not used for the production of weapons-grade material. The I.A.E.A. is the only forum in which the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain have worked without serious friction and without a Soviet veto. Already it inspects many reactors throughout the world, and its importance was increased last week when Great Britain, following an earlier United States initiative, opened its largest reactor to inspection.

But the I.A.E.A. has not received the full support it merits—and demands. The reactor we helped India to build is subject, by prior condition, to I.A.E.A. inspection—and it has remained peaceful. But another reactor, built with Canadian help, is not subject to equivalent conditions—and in this reactor the Indians may have produced their weapons-grade fissionable material.

### Asks Reactor Inspection

We should insist, at a minimum, that all reactors built with the help of other powers be subject to I.A.E.A. inspection. Indeed, I think the time has come to insist that all peaceful reactors be subject to inspection. But we ourselves must also top assisting nations which refuse inspection. In the past, for fear of antagonizing the Europeans, we have sold enriched uranium to Euratom without requiring that its plants be open to I.A.E.A. inspection. We have thus aided the construction of reactors in Spain, France, Germany and Holland, all of which are closed to the outside world. Until they are opened, all our assistance to their creation or functioning should cease. In this connection, I would like to pay tribute to the work of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and particularly to Senators Anderson and Pastore, who have long insisted on adequate international safeguards on our nuclear-assistance programs.

A stronger stand in support of I.A.E.A. could have a major inhibiting effect on the diversion of peaceful nuclear plants to weapons work—for example, in such countries as Sweden or Switzerland. In fact, under the Pearson Government, Canada has shown the way by responsibly insisting on guaranteed peaceful use of any uranium it sells. That Canada has lost certain sales thereby proves the value of this policy; clearly, the material might well have gone to weapons. We should also work toward I.A.E.A. control of fabrication and reprocessing of all fuel for peaceful reactors.

Sixth, it is vital that we continue present efforts to lessen our own reliance on nuclear weapons. Since 1961,

concern throughout the Government that the problem of nuclear proliferation will remain where it belongs—in our constant attention, the object of our principal concern. And we can and must continue to re-examine our own attitudes—to insure that we do not lapse back into the fatalistic and defeatist belief that war is inevitable, or that our course is too fixed to be affected by what we do—to remember as President Kennedy said, that “no government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue”—and to remember that, “In the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We are breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s future. And we are all mortal.”

Above all, we must recognize what is at stake. We must face realities—however unpleasant the sight, however difficult the challenge they pose us. And we must realize that peace is not inaction, nor the mere absence of war. “Peace,” said President Kennedy “is a process—a way of solving problems.” It is only as we devote our every effort to the solution of these problems that we are at peace; it is only if we succeed that there will be peace for our children.

## OREGON ACTS TO BAR YOUTH RACIAL FIGHTS

ASTORIA, Ore., June 23 (UPI)—A “potentially serious situation” at the Tongue Point Job Corps Center, heightened by recent fights among whites and Negroes, brought a request today from Gov. Mark O. Hatfield for more security forces.

Douglas Olds, the camp administrator, said there were two fights Monday night involving four boys. He termed the incidents a “racial misunderstanding.”

Classes were suspended yesterday morning so that small groups of trainees and counselors could discuss the problem. Classes were resumed in the afternoon.

The fights occurred in a dormitory where 500 trainees sleep. One boy suffered face cuts and another was struck on the head, according to Lynn Wyckoff, the information officer. Mr. Olds said the fights had started after white enrollees had used disparaging language to Negro youths.

## KENYA BANS RALLIES SUPPORTING UNIONS

Special to The New York Times  
NAIROBI, Kenya, June 23—President Jomo Kenyatta imposed a ban today on all public meetings and demonstrations for either of Kenya’s rival trade union groups.